

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are present in this application. By this Amendment, the specification has been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action contends that the use of the term “transverse” in the claims is indefinite, referring to an “accepted” meaning of “transverse” as “lying across or parallel to a plane.” Although Applicant does not concede this definition of “transverse” (actually, Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition, defines “transverse” as “acting, lying, or being across; set crosswise”), the specification has been amended to describe the first line 31 at an angle (or “transverse”) to the second side 1402 of the base plate 14. Support for this Amendment can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the specification and in Figs. 3-8. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of “transverse” is now clearly defined in the specification and in fact is consistent with its ordinary meaning. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0103637 to Huang. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

An important feature of the invention defined in claim 1 is that the first, second and third axes of the first, second and third transducer coupling portions extend in different directions. The Office Action contends that Huang discloses this subject matter, referring to front main channel sound effect (F), the center sound effect (C) and the surround sound effect (S) where the sound effects are all located on axes extending in mutually different directions. The angle of the sound effects, however, is distinguishable from the subject matter of the claimed invention, defining angles of the first, second and third transducer coupling portions. Indeed, in Huang,

only one of the three speakers is angled differently from the other speakers (see paragraph [0036] and Figs. 5 and 6 of Huang), and the sound chambers to which the speakers are mounted are unvaried in angle. Adjustments to the sound output by the speakers are realized by varying the depth of mounting of the speakers in the sound chambers and not by any type of angular adjustment. As noted, claim 1 in contrast requires that all three of the first, second and third axes of the first, second and third transducer coupling portions extend in different directions. This structure is distinguishable from Huang, and for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced.

The structure described in Huang in fact suffers from the drawbacks noted with regard to the prior art discussed in the Background section of the present specification with reference to Fig. 9. That is, as described in the specification, each of the sound enclosures in Huang requires a dedicated mold for fabrication. Additionally, each of the sound enclosures must be assembled to the respective sound channel transducer before the transducer can be positioned between the cap member and the cover member. As a consequence, manufacturing costs are increased. Additionally, in Huang, mid-range and low-range sound reproduction is poor due to second harmonic distortion attributed to sound-guiding activity of the sound enclosures. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the base plate is formed *integrally* with the first, second and third transducer coupling portions, thereby eliminating the need for a dedicated mold for each coupling portion and the need to assemble the sound enclosures before positioning the transducers. As noted, in Huang, the sound chambers (elements 11, 12 and 13 in Fig. 4) are very clearly separate from the cover (element 30 in Fig. 4). In paragraph [0037], Huang describes that each of the sound chambers can be directly combined inside the housing (element 10 in Fig. 4), however, there is no disclosure of how the sound chambers are “directly combined,” and certainly no disclosure

with respect to the cover of Huang being integrally formed with the sound chambers thereof. For this reason also, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is misplaced.

With regard to the dependent claims, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Huang. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Huang does not provide any suggestion to modify its disclosure to correct those deficiencies noted above with regard to independent claim 1. As such, Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on an allowable independent claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

TSAI
Appl. No. 10/830,057
April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Alan M. Kagen/
 Alan M. Kagen
 Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jl
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100